

### REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is submitted in response to the Official Letter dated December 17, 2003, in which the Examiner rejected Claims 6-10 and 22-31. Applicants request reconsideration of these Claims in light of the remarks submitted below. Thus, Claims 6-10 and 22-31 are pending and remain for consideration.

The Examiner rejected Claims 27, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,110,087 to Studtmann et al. (hereinafter Studtmann). Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner views Studtmann as showing one radial armature shoulder G which defines a first lateral flux gap G-G with a first pole shoulder. The Examiner also views Studtmann as showing a second armature "shoulder" F defining a second lateral flux gap F-F with a second pole shoulder. This is not a correct viewing of Studtmann. Studtmann only shows one radial shoulder gap (G-G) that results in a radial or lateral magnetic force. The gap F-F is not a lateral gap as is specifically claimed. The gap F-F is between faces of an armature and a pole piece, not between shoulders and is therefore an axial gap. Thus, the magnetic force between them is in an axial direction, not lateral. This is also specifically recited in Studtmann, particularly at Column 11, Lines 14-15, the air gap F-F is defined as "an axial air gap". At Column 11, Lines 24-25, the air gap G-G is defined as "a radial working gap". The first and second lateral flux gaps of the claimed invention are of the shoulder design and are lateral gaps, that is, situated at or on the side. Thus, the axial gap F-F cannot be a lateral gap as is recited in the Applicants' claims. Similarly, with respect to Claims 30 and 31, the gap R-R is a face to face gap and thus, the same remarks about the gap F-F also apply to the gap R-R. Also, gaps R-R and G-G are not formed in a stepped relation to each other as claimed, shown in the Figures, and described in the Specification, but rather are positioned perpendicularly to each other. Therefore, Studtmann does not anticipate or make obvious the Applicants' invention as defined by the Applicants' claims. Accordingly, the Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections. Since Claims 28 and 29 depend from Claim 27, those claims should be allowable as well, for at least that reason. Similarly, Claim 31 depends from Claim 30 and should be allowable for at least that reason.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 6-10, 22-26, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being obvious over Studtmann in view of U.S. Patent 5,503,184 to Reinart et al. (hereinafter Reinart). However, the remarks above also apply to Studtmann as the Examiner applies Studtmann as a reference to Claim 6. Thus, for at least these reasons, the Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections. Since Claims 7-10 and 22-26 depend from Claim 6, those claims should be allowable as well, for at least that reason.

In view of the foregoing amendment, remarks and arguments, it is believed that Claims 6-10 and 22-31 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicants contend that all of the pending claims are patentable over the Examiner's rejections, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the Claims.